



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/671,408

09/24/2003

John H. Zybura

MS1-1686US

8391

22801 7590 10/13/2009
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

YEN, SYLING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/13/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/671,408	Applicant(s) ZYBURA ET AL.	
	Examiner SYLING YEN	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 15, 16, 18-20 and 22-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 15-16, 18-20 and 22-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on July 27, 2009. Claims 12, 14, 17, 21 and 30-33 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 13, 15, 18-19 and 22-28. Claims 1-11, 13, 15-16, 18-20 and 22-29 are pending.
2. Applicants' arguments filed July 27, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2, 8, 13, 19-20, 22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yellepeddy et al (US Patent Application 2003/0145003 A1, hereinafter, "Yellepeddy").

Art Unit: 2166

5. With respect to claim 1,

Yellepeddy discloses **a computer-executable method, comprising:**

receiving, by a computing device, an indication of a change to data comprising a reference in a first external object in a first namespace (Yellepeddy [0054] and Fig. 1 e.g. the Joiner receives changes made to a joined object [as a first external object] in a directory [as first name space]), **wherein the reference refers to a second external object in the first namespace, the first external object and the second external object each having an associated central representation in a second namespace** (Yellepeddy [0060] - [0062] and [0064] and Fig. 2-4 e.g. the Joiner merges selected data items, e.g. first name [as first external object & the reference in the first external object], title, work telephone from HR database [as first name space] to create an entry in a local table for Mr. Kent, the multiple local tables of heterogeneous directories, e.g. HR database, Notes NAB [as third name space], NT Domain Directory [as forth name space] and NW3.x Bindary [as fifth name space] are combined to create a joined table [as central representation] which provides a homogenous view [as second/central name space] of the joined heterogeneous data);

evaluating, by the computing device, an association between the central representation of the second object and the second object in the first namespace to identify a third external object in a third namespace (Yellepeddy [0054], [0062] and Fig. 1 e.g. the Joiner evaluates the changes, e.g. changes made to the telephone number [as third external object] from other department, e.g. Notes NAB are valid, and then propagate them to the other directories [as a third namespace]), **the third external**

Art Unit: 2166

object and the second external object sharing a unique identifier (Yellepeddy [0053] and Fig. 1 e.g. Each object joined entry [as sharing a unique identifier] for a data store is reflected as a row entry in the corresponding LT); **and**

propagating, by the computing device, the changed data to the third namespace to update the third external object and to update a fourth external object of the third namespace (Yellepeddy [0054], [0062] and Fig. 1 e.g. the Joiner propagates the changes, e.g. changes made to the telephone number [as updating the third external object] and home address [as updating the fourth external object] attributes from other department, to the other directories [as the third namespace] within the metadirectory) **which includes a reference to the third external object** (Yellepeddy [0054], [0062] and Fig. 1 e.g. home address [as a reference] attributes from other department, to the other directories within the metadirectory),

wherein the references in the first and fourth external objects are the names of the first and fourth external objects in their respective namespaces and differ based on those namespaces (Yellepeddy [0025]-[0028], [0062] e.g. Robert Smith in data source 1, Bob Smith in data source 2, Rob Smith in data source 3, the mailing address for "Robert Smith"; and home address [as the references are the names of the first (e.g. Robert **or** Bob) and fourth (e.g. mailing address **or** home address) external object in their respective namespaces and differ based on those namespaces]).

6. With respect to claim 2,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the indication of the change comprises a notice that the reference to the second external object was added, modified, or deleted** (see Yellepeddy [0061], where the metadirectory ("MD") may be a master, slave or peer to the managed data sources, which determines which entities may create, modify and delete data objects).

7. With respect to claim 8,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the second namespace comprises a metadirectory** (see Yellepeddy [0060], where the basic join operation performed by the metadirectory).

8. Concerning claims 13 and 20,

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claims 1 and 8. Therefore claims 13 and 20 are rejected for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 8.

9. With respect to claim 19,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the central representation comprises an aggregation of information from the first object and the third object** (see Yellepeddy [0056], where the Joiner includes (a) disparate information sources about a single entity or common subject are grouped into a single entry in the metadirectory through linking information in multiple data into an aggregate).

10. With respect to claim 22,

Yellepeddy further discloses **receiving, by a computing device, an indication of a name change** (see Yellepeddy [0061], where the metadirectory ("MD") may be a master, slave or peer to the managed data sources, which determines which entities

Art Unit: 2166

may create, modify and delete data objects) **of a first referent object in a reference field of a first referent object in a first namespace, the reference field formatted in accordance with the first namespace;**

propagating, by the computing device, the name change (see Yellepeddy [0078], where As previously discussed, the Joiner normally stores local copies of entries from the directories being managed by the metadirectory. When the Joiner receives an update operation (81) for an entry in a directory, it performs an "apply" operation (82) on a selected entry in the metadirectory local table, creating a temporary modified entry containing the result of the update) **to the second referent object to update the second referent object.**

11. Concerning claim 26

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claim 1 because claim 26 is a computer-readable medium claims for implementing those methods of claim 1. Therefore claim 26 is rejected for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2166

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by Yellepeddy as applied to claims 1-2, 8, 13, 19-20, 22, and 26 above, and further in view of Thatcher et al (U.S. Patent 6,061,743 hereinafter, "Thatcher").

15. With respect to claim 3,

Although Yellepeddy substantially teaches the claimed invention, Yellepeddy does not explicitly indicate **evaluating correlation information that correlates objects in the first namespace with objects in the second namespace.**

Thatcher teaches the limitation by stating **evaluating correlation information that correlates objects in the first namespace with objects in the second namespace** (Thatcher col. 2 lines 30-39 and col. 8 lines 45-61 e.g. A target object in the first namespace is selected. If the target object has an association with the second namespace, the second namespace is accessed and at least a portion of the second namespace is determined. At least a portion of the second namespace is displayed in

Art Unit: 2166

relation to the target object; when the user requests to expand the target 51A, at least a portion of the foreign namespaces 54 will be displayed in the user interface 57 relative to the target 51A.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of namespace, at the time of the present invention, having the teachings of Yellepeddy and Thatcher before him/her, to modify the namespace method of Thatcher, wherein the method would include teachings of Thatcher because that would have allowed the method to provide the capability for aggregating disparate namespaces, independent of the type of namespaces, wherein each namespace does not require intimate knowledge of the other namespaces (see Thatcher col. 2 lines4-7).

16. With respect to claim 4,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the correlation information comprises a persistent data store that associates central representations in the second namespace with external objects in other namespaces** (see Yellepeddy [0064], where These multiple local tables are then combined to created a joined table ("JT") by a table joining function (45)).

17. With respect to claim 5,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the association comprises a link between a unique identifier for each central representation in the second namespace and unique identifies for each external object** (see Yellepeddy [0047], where a metadirectory: (c) it is able to flow a pointer such as an LDAP Universal

Art Unit: 2166

Resource Locator ("IURL") to the information that a metadirectory must resolve for the metadirectory user).

18. With respect to claim 6,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the unique identifier comprises a globally unique identifier** (see Yellepeddy [0047], where a metadirectory: (c) it is able to flow a pointer such as an LDAP Universal Resource Locator ("IURL") to the information that a metadirectory must resolve for the metadirectory user).

19. With respect to claim 7,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the persistent data store comprises a table** (see Yellepeddy [0064], where These multiple local tables are then combined to created a joined table ("JT") by a table joining function (45)).

20. With respect to claim 9,

Thatcher further discloses **wherein each object comprises an entity** (Thatcher Fig. 1 e.g. User Object).

21. With respect to claim 10,

Thatcher further discloses **wherein each entity comprises a unique identifier that is immutable and a name** (Thatcher Fig. 1 e.g. User Object: Given Name, Last Name, Login Name).

22. With respect to claim 11,

Thatcher further discloses **wherein the name is mutable** (Thatcher Fig. 1 e.g. User Object: Login Name).

23. Concerning claims 15, 16 and 18,

Art Unit: 2166

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claims 4-6, 10, and 11. Therefore claims 15, 16 and 18 are rejected for at least the same reasons as claims 4-6, 10, and 11.

24. Concerning claims 23-25,

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claims 4, 6 and 10. Therefore claims 23-25 are rejected for at least the same reasons as claims 4, 6 and 10.

25. Concerning claims 27-29,

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claims 3, 5-6 and 10 because claims 27-29 are computer-readable medium claims for implementing those methods of claims 3, 5-6 and 10. Therefore claims 27-29 are rejected for at least the same reasons as claims 3, 5-6 and 10.

Response to Argument

26. On pages 10-12, Applicant argues that:

Independent Claim 1

[0005] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, Yellepeddy does not disclose the claimed:

receiving, by a computing device, an indication of a change to data comprising a reference in a first external object in a first namespace, wherein the reference refers to a second external object in the first namespace, the first

Art Unit: 2166

external object and the second external object each having an associated central representation in a second namespace;

evaluating, by the computing device, an association between the central representation of the second object and the second object in the first namespace to identify a third external object in a third namespace, the third external object and the second external object sharing a unique identifier; and

propagating, by the computing device, the changed data to the third namespace to update the third external object and to update a fourth external object of the third namespace which includes a reference to the third external object,

wherein the references in the first and fourth external objects are the names of the first and fourth external objects in their respective namespaces and differ based on those namespaces.

Rather, Yellepeddy simply describes a metadirectory that joins tables from multiple databases for the same object (see paragraph 49). The metadirectory includes some, but not all, of the fields from each database (see paragraph 60). When a change is made to an entry in one of the databases, that change is communicated to a joiner of the metadirectory to determine whether the change is valid (paragraph 54). If valid, the change is propagated to other directories within the metadirectory.

Thus, at best Yellepeddy describes the propagating of a change from one directory to another. Nothing in Yellepeddy, however, discloses that the change is a change to a name of an object or that the names "differ based on those namespaces".

In fact, Yellepeddy only describes outright replication. Thus, any change that is propagated to another directory in Yellepeddy is to make the identical change to that other directory. If the change to the object in the other directory is to make the other object identical to the changed object, then those objects do not "differ based on" their respective directories. By enabling updating of a name that differs based on its namespaces, the claimed subject matter recognizes that different namespaces may have different naming conventions or requirements and that simple replication, as described in paragraph 54 of Yellepeddy, will not suffice for updating names of an object common to the different namespaces.

Consequently, Yellepeddy does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Yellepeddy does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Examiner disagrees because:

Yellepeddy teaches the claimed subject matter. In fact, Yellepeddy discloses a **computer-executable method, comprising:**

receiving, by a computing device, an indication of a change to data comprising a reference in a first external object in a first namespace (Yellepeddy [0054] and Fig. 1 e.g. the Joiner receives changes made to a joined object [as a first external object] in a directory [as first name space]), **wherein the reference refers to a second external object in the first namespace, the first external object and the second external object each having an associated central representation in a second namespace** (Yellepeddy [0060] - [0062] and [0064] and Fig. 2-4 e.g. the Joiner

Art Unit: 2166

merges selected data items, e.g. first name [as first external object & the reference in the first external object], title, work telephone from HR database [as first name space] to create an entry in a local table for Mr. Kent, the multiple local tables of heterogeneous directories, e.g. HR database, Notes NAB [as third name space], NT Domain Directory [as forth name space] and NW3.x Bindary [as fifth name space] are combined to create a joined table [as central representation] which provides a homogenous view [as second/central name space] of the joined heterogeneous data);

evaluating, by the computing device, an association between the central representation of the second object and the second object in the first namespace to identify a third external object in a third namespace (Yellepeddy [0054], [0062] and Fig. 1 e.g. the Joiner evaluates the changes, e.g. changes made to the telephone number [as third external object] from other department, e.g. Notes NAB are valid, and then propagate them to the other directories [as a third namespace]), **the third external object and the second external object sharing a unique identifier** (Yellepeddy [0053] and Fig. 1 e.g. Each object joined entry [as sharing a unique identifier] for a data store is reflected as a row entry in the corresponding LT); **and**

propagating, by the computing device, the changed data to the third namespace to update the third external object and to update a fourth external object of the third namespace (Yellepeddy [0054], [0062] and Fig. 1 e.g. the Joiner propagates the changes, e.g. changes made to the telephone number [as updating the third external object] and home address [as updating the fourth external object] attributes from other department, to the other directories [as the third namespace] within

Art Unit: 2166

the metadirectory) **which includes a reference to the third external object**

(Yellepeddy [0054], [0062] and Fig. 1 e.g. home address [as a reference] attributes from other department, to the other directories within the metadirectory),

wherein the references in the first and fourth external objects are the names of the first and fourth external objects in their respective namespaces and differ based on those namespaces (Yellepeddy [0025]-[0028], [0062] e.g. Robert Smith in data source 1, Bob Smith in data source 2, Rob Smith in data source 3, the mailing address for "Robert Smith"; and home address [as the references are the names of the first (e.g. Robert **or** Bob) and fourth (e.g. mailing address **or** home address) external object in their respective namespaces and differ based on those namespaces]).

Conclusion

27. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2166

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SyLing Yen whose telephone number is 571-270-1306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached at 571-272-3978. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

/Isaac M. Woo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2166

SyLing Yen
Examiner
Art Unit 2166

/Syling Yen/

October 5, 2009